

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR  
911 SERVICE OVERSIGHT MEETING

Monday, June 14, 2004

1:40 p.m.

Inn at Grand Glaize

Osage Beach, Missouri

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Charles Jackson, Chairman; Mr. James Person; Mr. Roger Porter; Mr. Sherman George; Ms. Arie Crawford; Mr. James R. (Bob) Asahl; Mr. Andrew J. Bettman; Ms. Barbara Gulick

Visitors Present: Mr. John Williams, St. Louis Fire Department; Mr. Gene Lacy, MO State Highway Patrol

REPORTED BY: Monnie S. VanZant, CCR, CSR, RPR  
Midwest Litigation Services  
714 W. High Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
(573) 636-7551

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MR. JACKSON: We're calling to order the Advisory Committee for the 911 service oversight agenda. We ask that you speak one at a time since we have a court reporter that is taking our minutes for this meeting. I'd like to start the roll call of the members.

Roger D. Porter?

MR. PORTER: Here.

MR. JACKSON: Roger D. Young?

James R. Asahl?

MR. ASAHL: Here.

MR. JACKSON: Greg Ballentine?

Peggy Lohman? Carol Freeman? Arie Crawford?

MS. CRAWFORD: Here.

MR. JACKSON: Andrew Bettman?

MR. BETTMAN: Here.

MR. JACKSON: I'd like to take this time to welcome Mr. Bettman. He's a new member of the committee. We welcome you and thank you for your service.

Sheriff Ferrell? He's not here.

Chief Sherman George?

MR. GEORGE: Here.

MR. JACKSON: Chief Person?

MR. PERSON: Here.

MR. JACKSON: Barb Gulick?

MS. GULICK: Here.

MR. JACKSON: Randall Jotte? And John Wade?

We're one shy of a quorum, but we will proceed. We'd like to just give Mr. Bettman the opportunity just to have any words that you'd like to say, give us a little bit of background about yourself if you would.

MR. BETTMAN: My name is Andy Bettman, I have been police commissioner in the city of Frontenac for nine years, currently elected Commissioner for two years and also a member of the Frontenac Board of Aldermen. I've been an alderman for four years. Police Commissioner, this will be my eighth year. And I have worked with 911 issues that we've had regionally and other intra-operative issues. So I take a delight in being here, and I think this is a great opportunity. I'll commend the committee on the work they're doing. I've gotten the chance to go through some of the notes that I've had, and I look forward to working with you and in forwarding other efforts.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you. Mr. Bettman replaces Mayor Errol Bush whose term expired. Mr. Wakeman, turn it to your hands.

MR. WAKEMAN: The next order of business is under the heading of Old Business. And it's basically the review of the minutes from the March 16th meeting. You should have a copy in your packet. But as you can see, our March 16th meeting was in conjunction with the Missouri numbering -- what was it?

MR. PORTER: Emergency numbering.

MR. WAKEMAN: Emergency Numbering Association. It was held in Tan-Tar-A, and we had quite a few visitors along with a quorum. So if we would like, I can read the minutes, or, everyone take a look at the minutes and see if there's any corrections that need to be made. If you'll look on page 2, I believe, it's the second paragraph, eighth line down, it said three-year decertification. Decertification should read recertification instead of decertification. Is that correct?

MR. PORTER: (Mr. Porter nods head.)

MR. PERSON: Do we need a motion on this?

MR. WAKEMAN: Actually, since we don't have a quorum, all we need is any recommended corrections, so when we are able to get a quorum, we can approve the minutes.

MR. JACKSON: Okay.

MR. WAKEMAN: Any other recommended corrections to the minutes? Before we go on to the New Business, I would like to point out that in your packets I've copied a number of articles out of the most recent 911 magazine in addition to the ones that we've sent in the previous mailings. There's a number of really good items in here, intra-operability versus connectivity. When we start talking about intra-operable communications, what does that mean? And this is a good review on what it should be with emergency responders. And another one, using the incident command system in the 911 center, I think, is a really good article. And then there are a couple others that are worth reading. Not that everything in the magazine isn't worth reading. It's just that these are probably the most important articles you can see in there. I also get a couple of other emergency type magazines, as we find articles that apply to 911, we will copy those and provide those to you. Seeing no other old business, let's move to new business. Mr. Porter, I believe you're next on the docket.

MR. PORTER: In your packets, you will find four pages of courses that the subcommittee has reviewed since our last meeting, our meeting on March 16th and our meeting of May 12th. We have ran tentative or interim approval for these courses. I guess we will hold to the next meeting to grant final approval from the full committee. Would that be correct?

MR. PERSON: If there was consensus, but not an actual vote since the chair approves those anyway in his official capacity, wouldn't that be allowable?

MR. WAKEMAN: Yes.

MR. JACKSON: Is there any advisory status?

MR. PERSON: I mean, if our subcommittee has made that recommendation and the consensus of the group that's here today is that we can do that, you as the director are the one that signs the paper work anyway. So you could go ahead and approve those without there being an official vote. I would suggest that we look around the room and see if anyone has a problem with that.

MR. WAKEMAN: First of all, I have no problem with it. The interpretation is that it's part of our board procedures that we've established. However, the Code of State Regulations allows us to avoid that if we wish and move on with this as we've discovered and you have, too, Chief, that this is pretty intensive work to get all these approved and submitted. And there's no sense in waiting another three months before we get one formally approved.

MR. PORTER: Exactly.

MR. PERSON: Because we'll have another pile by then.

MR. PORTER: And I do believe we've recommended to the Director of Public Safety that he approve them. He still has -- or she still has the final authority on this. So I don't see any issues with recommending that the director authorize these courses. I don't know if we even need a vote.

MR. WAKEMAN: So, basically, as a big committee, we would, even without a quorum, concede that the subcommittee has the right to recommend that to the director.

MR. PERSON: I think if you ask around the room and there was consensus, you could just go ahead with that.

MR. JACKSON: We have consensus? (All committee members raised hands.)

MR. WAKEMAN: So the consensus of the committee is that the subcommittee's recommendation is submitted, recommended approval to the director, Chairman, the Director.

MR. JACKSON: Okay

MR. PORTER: With that, Mr. Wakeman, we have one other issue that the chairman had tasked us with at the last meeting, that Chief Person form a subcommittee. And I'd like to at this time turn that over to him to explain what that subcommittee has come up with as far as our training standards.

MR. PERSON: For lack of a better term, I guess what we're going to call it is, the training certification task force is sort of what you called it at the last meeting. We did put a group together. I put a group together from MONENA, MO-APCO. Unfortunately, the representatives from Mid America Regional Counsel were not able to attend. However, we did have representation from the Police Chiefs Association, from the St. Louis County Police Chiefs Association and from the Sheriff's Association and from Jefferson City PD. We discussed the current certification process and the Code of State Regulations and determined that the way the regulations are written, it does seem to be broad enough that we can make certain changes in that certification process without having to go back through any legal re-wording of the regulations or without any statutory changes as long as we stay within certain guidelines. To that end, what the group came to a consensus about this morning was that instead of changing the whole process, they would like to look at changing the categories or the criteria narrowing them -- or broadening them, I guess, from the eight APCO standards to four standards similar to the way POST is set up. They also discussed that those 16 hours in the refresher should be considered minimum and that, should some dispatcher choose to take courses that would put them over those minimum hours, they should still be getting credit for the number of hours that they are attending those courses. Therefore, the 16 hours would still be broken into the four categories. They would have to get the prescribed number of hours within those four disciplines. But any hours that they would get over and above that, they may have 18 hours of certified training instead of 16 hours. But they would still have credit for that number of hours. So, in essence, the number of hours in the seat will equate to the number of hours given credit. I've asked that R.D. and Sheldon Lineback from the Police Chiefs Association and a representative from Jefferson City PD put together a program, if you will,

and bring it back. Jefferson City PD has actually already split those eight into the four categories from POST and have programmed that into their computers. So they're going to work on that. And by the time we have our next meeting, we'll actually have something more firm to hand out to the Board and hopefully we'll be able to go forward from there without any legislative change. It will just be an internal procedural change. Is that stated pretty well?

MR. PORTER: Very well. I think that the key thing here is the course curriculum itself, I really don't see a major change in that. I think what we're looking at is just restructuring the eight basic cores into four, which shouldn't be an issue.

MR. PERSON: I actually got the impression from the meeting that those people that are managing the personnel would be in favor of taking this as a first step towards the actual certification of dispatchers, and the monitoring or auditing or regulating of that training in their certification much the way that peace officers are and eventually coming back in and asking that there be some mandatory training with sanctions in enforcement capability at the State level to actually regulate those personnel and make sure that there's some teeth in the training statute.

MR. PORTER: Yeah.

MR. WAKEMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Chief. Anything else on the curriculum subcommittee? Any other report? Jim, did you have –

MR. ASAHL: No.

MR. WAKEMAN: I thought I saw your hand up there. Legislative committee report. In your packet, I gave you copy of Senate Bill –

MR. PORTER: Excuse me. Sherman has a question.

MR. WAKEMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. GEORGE: Am I understanding that right now both those courses do not go towards the same certification? Did I miss something?

MR. PERSON: There is no State certification for dispatchers.

MR. GEORGE: All right.

MR. PERSON: At this point, we certify courses based on the APCO 33 standards and assign a certain number of hours in each of the eight core categories. The Director of Public Safety certifies a course as meeting those requirements. But there's a statute saying that the dispatchers will receive this training, but there's no enforcement or no sanctions to go along with that. So if an agency -- if a peace officer says no, I'm not going to do that, there's really nothing -- whereas if a fire fighter, EMT, police officer fails to get their training or to maintain their training –

MR. GEORGE: They're out.

MR. PERSON: Right.

MR. BETTMAN: One question. I'm a bit of an officer, so I apologize. It might be something we've discussed a hundred times. I don't mean to be redundant, but -- POST certification, I know police dispatchers and if -- there are some communities, dispatching is flipped between fire and police. And some situation or some dispatchers -- St. Louis County has a lot more departments. You're talk about moving more towards a dispatch program. Are the standards the same for both, for the fire and the police department? In other words, the police departments as a rule all have to be POST certified. I don't know if that's the same case with non-police dispatchers or not.

MR. PERSON: All of the standards for dispatchers are the same. There's one statute -- they have to attend a 16-hour course for police or a 16-hour course for fire or 16 hour course for EMT. However, if they are a joined operation, then they have to go to a 40 hour course within the first year of employment, 16 hours continuing education every two years after that.

MR. BETTMAN: So all of them have CEUs now.

MR. PERSON: However, while the statute says that they will receive this training, and while it empowers the director of public safety to certify those courses, unlike POST, there's no certification for the dispatcher or there's no sanction should an agency fail to train their dispatcher, other than whatever civil liability there may be.

MR. BETTMAN: I assume that's something that we want to put forth in the legislation.

MR. PERSON: That is something that this task force, I think, is willing to-- from what they were talking about today, that's what they would like to put forward. However, the easiest change and the first change that can be made would be to make these training regulations, the certification regulations a little easier to manage. And that's what we're looking at. And then after that -- because that wouldn't require any statutory change at this point.

MR. BETTMAN: Thanks. I appreciate it.

MR. WAKEMAN: Any other questions? One of the other things that I would like to bring up at least while we're talking about education is the fact that we do receive a lot of material in the mail from vendors. And one of the ones we got most recently is from a company called Channing Veet (ph.). And they do a lot of public awareness type documents. I'm going to pass these around for everybody to look at. But it's, Call 911 For Help, and a brochure about 911 and some other things that they do offer. And, of course, it's all at a price, but it's something that we'd like to pass around for everybody to look at.

Okay. Anything else on the curriculum supplement? We've discovered in the last couple years since we started this that this is a very large project, the curriculum subcommittee and the curriculum work that goes on with this. And there are a lot of people and a lot of

departments that are doing a lot of great training out there with their telecommunicators, and I think probably we can say in the last three years as a general rule, our telecommunicators have gotten a lot more training and education in how to do that business.

The next item of new business is the Legislative Committee Report, and Ms. Lohman is not here. The only thing we'd like to report is that the House and Senate have passed Senate Bill 715. I'm not quite sure how to describe this because there was a companion bill that went along with it that did not get passed. R.D., did you want to you discuss that just a little bit?

MR. PORTER: Senate Bill 715 was actually a very comprehensive county bill. There were a lot of issues, a lot of legislation that was combined into one big bill that predominately was what county governments were wanting. Part of that was also a bill that I think Senator Griesheimer had put out that had an impact on Warren and Franklin County originally. They had also gotten approved 715 along with some other wireless legislation that had been proposed, the original Senate Bill 784 which was the 911 wireless funding billing was part of 715. And it was -- continued to be in 715 until it got to the House floor. And the wireless portion of 715 was taken out on the floor in the House in the last week of session. With that, you all will take a look at the last page of, subsection 9, subsection 10 of six -- of 653.20 -- 653.30. Subsection 10, it says, Advise the Department of Public Safety and the Office of Administration on the administration of grants from the 911 emergency services fund, created pursuant to Section 190.312. Well, 190.312 was the new wireless language that did establish a state-wide grant fund to be disbursed to county and local governments in the collection of the wireless fee. Since that portion, the wireless portion of the bill, was removed, there isn't actually a 190.312. So if you go and try to look at the statute, 190.312 doesn't exist. That was the new wireless section. So with that said, I did apply in November, I believe of last year, for a statewide grant to assist and implement a statewide wireless services. But that grant was not approved. If the State would ever have access to funds or establish a fund and is under 190.312, then this committee would have advice and consent probably over that fund. But right now, that fund does not exist.

MR. WAKEMAN: And this Bill is yet to be signed by the governor. I don't think that the word we're getting is we don't think it's going to be signed. For the benefit of our committee, one of the actions under the previous bill was to do away with the 911 wireless committee. I don't know if you know that there is one, but there is. And we seem to be dealing with more and more wireless issues on this committee, and it seems ridiculous and redundant to have two committees handle the same information. I don't know that that's functioning. Do you?

MR. PORTER: It's not functional, but there are -- on the public safety side, there are three members elected to that. One of the companies that had positions on that Board doesn't even exist anymore.

MR. WAKEMAN: Any other legislative questions or input?

MR. PORTER: For those of you that aren't aware, our wireless bill did fail this year. It did make it through the Senate. It did not make it to the House. There were some major, major opposition from a specific wireless carrier or two wireless carriers to the legislation. They

have asked to sit down and meet this summer to try to resolve those issues. Missouri is only one of seven states left in the nation that does not have funding for wireless 911. This year, Kansas and Hawaii both passed it. So now we're down to -- for populous, we're the most populous, progressive state in the nation not to have it. So I don't know for sure what's going to happen this legislative year. But I do foresee the future where the federal government will mandate it. We're down to less than seven states, and Missouri's the most populous of those seven.

MR. PERSON: Is the rub still cost recovery?

MR. PORTER: The rub is still cost recovery. Yes. And though it was so adamantly opposed, the carrier in April imposed \$1.03 fee on the cell phone bill for wireless 911.

MR. JACKSON: What are they doing with the money?

MR. PORTER: They're keeping the money.

MR. PERSON: If you look on your cell phone bill, it will be on there. They'll have a fee for 911. They collect a fee right now.

MR. PORTER: Yeah

MR. BETTMAN: Which one opposed it? Which wireless company?

MR. PORTER: It -- is it appropriate to say?

MR. WAKEMAN: Probably offline would be better.

MR. PORTER: We'll discuss it after the meeting.

MR. WAKEMAN: Anything else on legislation? Next item on New Business is an update on the Homeland Security grant program. As many of you know, one of my additional duties is working with the state Homeland Security grant program. It has grown from a minimal program to one that has now taken most of my time. But at the last meeting, the 911 committee, I announced that we were sending out an open application for interoperable communications in which 911 systems were also eligible to work under that grant. The grant closed on the 10th of May. We received 271 applications. Of those 271 applications, 17 of them were ineligible. We did review 254 applications, and the amount was for \$27 million for an available grant of three and a half million dollars. We had a peer review. And that process is nearly complete and will be complete shortly so that we can make the announcements. I don't know if you got anything. They've kept me in the dark.

MR. PORTER: He didn't.



MR. WAKEMAN: So, anyway, that's still going. And, basically, we had – I believe the numbers I was given this morning was, we had 168 applications for interoperable communications, 63 applications for 911 systems improvements and I think it was 20 some -- however, that adds out for emergency management software. And those were the three eligible categories. On the interoperable communications, the requirements were given to us as far as the eligible items by the state-wide interoperability executive committee, which is dealing with interoperable communications. So anyway, the recipients of this grant will be announced on or about July 15th. And we think that's going good. However, we are in the midst of other competitive grants at this point. The volunteer fire fighter district grants, EMS grants, citizen core grants and the law enforcement terrorism prevention program grants are all out there working. And we will have those done soon. We have to have them done soon. Any questions about the grant process? (No response.)

MR. WAKEMAN: Any other new business to be brought up?

MR. PORTER: I'm not sure if it's under new business –

MR. WAKEMAN: Or open discussion.

MR. PORTER: Or open discussion on the voice of IPs. I've submitted, I think, everyone a copy of a letter.

MR. WAKEMAN: Before we get into open discussion, let's go ahead and establish the meeting date for September's quarterly meeting, August or September.

MR. JACKSON: Did everybody get it?

MR. WAKEMAN: In the past, we've had our September meetings in conjunction with the Missouri Association of Public Safety.

MR. PORTER: MO-APCO.

MR. WAKEMAN: MO-APCO. But I would say since we've been out on the road the last two, we ought to schedule this one back in Jefferson City at the State Emergency Operations Center. We have some dates available when the State Emergency Operations Center is not busy: 7 through 10 September, September 20th, 22nd through 24th and 27 through 30th. So if everybody would check their calendars and see if we can get a consensus. Any of them okay?

MS. GULICK: No. The last one's not good.

MR. PORTER: When is Labor Day?

MS. GULICK: 3rd and 4th.

MR. PORTER: 3rd and 4th.

MR. ASAHL: Labor Day is the 6th.

MR. PORTER: And 7th.

MR. WAKEMAN: We've got that all week, so if you want to do another date that week or the week of September 20th -- what? The 20th?

MR. ASAHL: Yeah.

MR. WAKEMAN: The 20th.

MR. JACKSON: Open right now. How about everybody else? September 20th?

MS. GULICK: That's good.

MR. WAKEMAN: Okay. September 20th at 1300 at State Emergency Operations Center in Jefferson City, Missouri. That may be good. That will give MO-APCO a chance to have their state convention and bring any issues to us if they'd like.

MS. GULICK: We just had a meeting conference last weekend. They're not having one until April, the regional one in April next year.

MR. WAKEMAN: So we don't have to worry about that?

MS. GULICK: No.

MR. WAKEMAN: Good. Didn't want to offend anybody. So our next meeting date is September 20th, 2004 at 1300, State Emergency Operations Center in Jefferson City, Missouri. Okay. Open discussion. Any other new business before we go on to open discussion? Mr. Porter, you have the floor.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Wakeman, Mr. Chairman, I have given the committee members a copy of a letter, a To Whom It May Concern letter from AT&T involving a relatively new technology called voice over IP or voice over the internet protocol. At the MO-APCO meeting last week I believe in the Missouri NENA group, we have reviewed this document and there's several issues that are going to be presented, not only to AT&T, but most of the emergency service providers that AT&T services. And this is a blanket request they have sent to just about every 911 center in the jurisdiction of AT&T Wireless asking for a specific number to send their computer user customers, their voice over IP calls to a non-emergency number or an emergency number not within the 911 network. Those groups are opposed to this. I know that in working with the National Governors Association, our government and the Public Service Commission have both filed issues with the federal communications committee on how data carriers -- and I'll classify them as data carriers rather than voice carriers -- how they are going to be delivering calls to 911 generated from a computer. There's lots of issues that has been raised. As the State 911 Coordinator, I will be sending a letter to

the governor as well, stating our concerns with this and concurring with the National Governors Association. I would like to see this committee, if not at this meeting, at the next meeting bring this up as an issue and hopefully we can get a presentation to this committee on this technology and this committee then at least be briefed in advance of issues that we may be seeing from not only FCC but maybe Congress itself. And it may come down to the Missouri legislature. I did receive a document two weeks ago. This technology is now available on PDAs. So you'll be able to theoretically generate a 911 call from your PDA device. And there is no way these vendors are in a position to deal with this.

MR. ASAHL: Question. Is the technology there yet to handle these type of situations?

MR. PORTER: Technology from the carrier's perspective or PSAP perspective?

MR. ASAHL: Both.

MR. PORTER: PSAP perspective, the answer is no. What data carriers, data providers are wanting to do and I think in one case they may have accomplished this is a 911 center actually have a computer connected to the internet with a specific IP address that the customers of that data carrier in that area can automatically be routed to that computer to a specific IP address of that computer. While that works as long as someone's computer is in the home and they have registered their address with their service provider, that technology like the laptops or like the computers is portable. You can take it anywhere, plug it into a wire line circuit, an internet service provider connection. And if you dial 911, it will still register your original address, back to your original ISP, even though you may be in a whole 'nother country. There are discussions with the National Emergency Number Association. The national office has made some consulatory agreements called voice over the network or VON Coalition. I don't think that the states have adopted or accepted that consensus agreement. I know Missouri has not accepted that consensus agreement. And I do -- it's my understanding, Barb, if you would, come in on Missouri APCO, Missouri part of the meeting we had Sunday, kind of move forward with that.

MS. GULICK: They're both -- I mean, MO-APCO has already said that they're not going to support anything with the VON issues, the coalition. They are going to try -- if I remember correctly, they're going to draft a letter that's going to be hopefully presented from APCO and MONENA as to joint thing suggesting or not suggesting -- outlining why it's not a good thing. It's one step worse than the wireless propositions in the State right now. With the wireless, you can at least get a little bit of something, but as you mentioned, you could be literally in a whole other country, and there's just no way that -- even Kansas City which is a fairly large PSAP can't even begin to handle this issue.

MR. WAKEMAN: I just mentioned to the chairman in side bar that I know the National Guard currently has voice over IP. And if you'd like, I'll bring them in the next meeting just to have them give us a short briefing on what that means and what it is.

MR. PORTER: Okay.

MR. WAKEMAN: Or maybe -- Mr. Porter wants to argue with me about it.

MR. PORTER: There's several issues when we're dealing with voice over IP. There's voice over private network, which is fairly functional and function in a normal manner. But that's truly voice over -- a controlled environment, let's say. And in that case, it would work inside on that controlled environment. The true voice over the internet, the public access still has a long way to go to even be to the levels of the most rudimentary wire line voice carrier.

MR. ASAHL: And that was the reason for my question. Because what little bit I've read about it is they do that -- yeah, there's issues there, but the technology might not be there yet to fix those issues.

MR. PORTER: Voice --

MR. ASAHL: That's for sure. The PSAPs don't have the equivalent to fix the issues.

MR. PORTER: Voice over the public internet totally changes the world as we know it when it comes to a 911 service. Because all of the things and the pitfalls that we face in a data world in a computerized world, your worms, your viruses, your down times, your up times, all of those issues now move into a 911 environment. And that instability is not an acceptable risk. Not just form. So will have a presentation, we'll get together and get a presentation before the whole group in September.

MR. WAKEMAN: Yeah. I wanted to point out one of the reasons that the National Guard went to voice over IP was to save money. And so if you're going to save money as a user, that means that the PSAPs that require some kind of money to continue to go and keep technology up can once again be cut out of any funding stream would help with that. So that's a real serious problem. We haven't solved the wireless problem yet, much less the voice over.

MR. PORTER: And this is by far much, much greater than the wireless issue.

MR. ASAHL: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

MR. PORTER: And the fact that not only is this is 911 funding issue, but it's a funding issue for state, for the county, for local government because under the FCC orders, anything on the data side is not taxable. So as they move that away and they move out of a wired environment or move from your local carriers, it's going to be a huge economic impact all the way around.

MR. WAKEMAN: Any other open discussion?

MR. JACKSON: Any other business? I want to thank the chief persons and I assume the people working on the other subcommittee issues. Thank you for working on that and bringing it to the committee's attention. I know that a lot of the other committee members sometimes feel like it's overwhelming, all the little nuances that go on, under currents that go on in this arena. And I think that once we get through the next couple of months and we start around the first of next year to really establish points, we want to try and get accomplished and move towards that. There was a person I was talking to prior to the meeting that -- I think

sometimes we're not -- we're just meeting and not really progressing. And some of the same issues are re-occurring that we address and then -- I think just to put together a plan of how we can attack this and get some progress. And, again, Mr. Bettman, I see that you've been negotiating within the wireless arena.

MR. BETTMAN: Well, I was interested when he started talking about the voice over. I've got to tell you, I'm not the most computer literate guy in the world. I came on a little bit too late. I can send an e-mail. My wife says I don't do a good job of that. But it seems to me that if I were prioritizing, I would see it as far more important. And in addition, I'm trying to envision how one would use a voice over any faster or to expedite a 911 call any faster than the cell phone why anybody would even bother with it. Maybe it's just that I don't understand its application. But we've had -- as an example, even in St. Louis County, the cellular issues are always there. We always have dead spots. Some of them have been dead spots for years. There really -- in some cases there are reasons for them. Municipal orders prohibit a tower. Other times it's just failure of communications systems to do anything to deal with it. One of the problems we've had in our area is analog versus digital. A lot of older systems use analog. And that's easy for them to dial because they sit in a cradle and you can see them and they're big. And one of the issues with that is we've already had a problem on our cell analog actually die. I mean, I'm sorry. Analog cell die. They just wouldn't -- it was off for a month. Some of our emergency equipment was on it, and some of the citizens were actually on it. And somebody tried to make an attempt to call 911 for an accident on I-64 and was unable to get through. Well, we finally raised holy living you know what with Cingular who denied there was any problem and finally admitted, said, look, we'll deal with it. We'll fix it. And they did. I have both my analog and digital. And I'm noticing that the analog and the digital-- analog doesn't work in areas where it used to work. The digital, because it's a half watt or 6.65 watts, although I understand the difference between analog, when you're in those hills, that extra two point something watts means an awful lot. I can still be down in the middle of Missouri somewhere and I can still have four dots on analog and have none on my digital. So I think that's one of the things that bothers me. And the consistency of this 911 thing sort of goes a little bit with -- I think if I understand you correctly the nature of the committee is we are working more toward trying to bring the cellular aspect of 911 into this picture. I'd love to see us work on the improvement of -- and the reason I'm so -- we have a limited scope, but it would be nice to see what we can do about someone reading or cajoling or whatever we have to do to get the providers to provide better service in the areas that they're in so that 911 works all over the state. And I don't know, you might be able to address it. How many 911 calls that come into the local or state police -- state police, local police agency or the sheriffs actually derive from cellulars now as opposed to land line? It would be interesting to know. I don't know if there's anybody that has an idea of that.

MR. WAKEMAN: Yeah. I think we've got a little bit of data on that.

MR. PORTER: Yeah. Historically, it's running between 30 and 40 percent depending on your locale. The metropolitan areas are at 40 to 45 percent. But if you look -- if you look over the scope of the whole state, between 30 and 40 percent of your calls from the 911 now are on a wireless device.

MR. BETTMAN: They're getting greater?

MR. PORTER: Yes. Yes.

MR. PERSON: The concern with the voice over IP is that -- the cost saving that he's talking about, someone's going to -- in the very near future not want to carry phone service, cell phone service and IP. They're going to go with their IP and be able to do cell phone and telephone functions just off of their PDA.

MR. PORTER: It's called voice, video and data all in one box.

MR. PERSON: I've got people in my department right now that have PDAs that are both cell phones, PDAs and are hooked to the internet. In the very near future, they're just going to be with their IP provider and they're going to do their voice over IP.

MR. WAKEMAN: Many of the state agencies, especially directors, are getting ready to go to something called Blackberry, which is exactly what that is. And so it's very difficult. T-mobile is also the same deal.

MR. WAKEMAN: Okay. Any other open discussion?

MR. JACKSON: Seeing nothing further, we thank everybody for coming in. I guess we don't have a quorum to adjourn, so --

MR. WAKEMAN: Do we still have a motion? We still have a motion to adjourn.

MR. JACKSON: Can we have a motion?

MR. PORTER: So moved.

MR. WAKEMAN: Mr. Porter has so moved.

MR. JACKSON: Okay. (The proceedings were concluded at 2:40 p.m. on June 14, 2004.)

